



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/529,792	09/27/2000	Aviv Refuah	092/00810(23	3705

67801 7590 05/11/2007
MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.
P.O. BOX 16446
ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/529,792

Applicant(s)

REFUAH ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B. Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-20, 92-93, 95-96, 100-101, 104-120, 123-125, 128-134, 136-138, and 160-163 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-3,5-20,92,93,95,96,100,101,104-120,123-125,128-134,136-138 and 160-163.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Invention I in the reply filed on 2/26/2007 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 140-159 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 2/26/2007.
3. The Restriction Requirement from 1/25/2007 inadvertently did not address claims 160-163. Because these claims are dependent upon elected claim 16, they are being treated as part of the elected invention and are addressed in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1,3,5-13, 19-20, 95,100, 104-112,114-120, 123-134, and 136-137 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al (US Patent 6,061,738) in view of Internationalization of Domain Names, July 1997 and further in view of Hedin et. al [EU.0387226 A1].

Art Unit: 2142

6. With respect to claim 1, the amendments do not further limit claim 1 because the claim had already required the information to be spell corrected therefore the amended claim is rejected for the reasons pointed out in the last office action mailed on 8/2/2005.
7. Claims 3,5-13, 19-20, 95,100, 104-112,114-120, 123-134, and 136-137 are rejected for the same reasoning pointed out in the last office action mailed on 8/2/2005.
8. Claims 2,14,92, 101, and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al (US Patent 6,061,738) in view of Internationalization of Domain Names, July 1997 and in view of Hedin et. al [EU.0387226 A1] as applied to claim 1 above in view of Cummings, R "A URL Alternative," Sep, 12,1997.
9. Claims 2,14,92, 101, and 113 are rejected for the same reasoning pointed out in the last office action mailed on 8/2/2005.
10. Claims 16-18,93,96,138,161-163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaku et al (US Patent 6,061,738) in view of Internationalization of Domain Names, July 1997 and in view of Hedin et. al [EU.0387226 A1] and further in view Jacobson et al (US Patent 6,070,157).
11. Claims 16-18,93,96,138, and 161-162 are rejected for the same reasoning pointed out in the last office action mailed on 8/2/2005.
12. As to claim 163, Jacobson teaches a method wherein providing a page address comprises providing an address of a page whose content is associated with the determined geographical location (col. 2, lines 37-45).

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2142

13. Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. First the applicant argues, with respect to claim 1, that Osaku teaches assigning pre-assigned codes for specific web address and therefore would not require spell correcting. The examiner disagrees with this argument for two reasons. First, the pre-assigned codes for specific web addresses could potentially be misspelled. Osaku gives the example of the term 'patent-search'. In the case were someone mistyped 'ptaent-search', spell checking would clearly come in handy. Second, Osaku also refers to the broader concept of finding a search engine (See Background). Search engines such as yahoo allowed natural language queries so with respect to this aspect of the Osaku invention, Osaku is teaching more than just supplying a pre-assigned code.

15. The applicant further argues, with respect to claim 1, that, "Cummings states that if the input is not a keyword, results of a search for the input are provided to the user. Cummings does not teach or suggest directly displaying a page for an input that does not match a pre-assigned keyword." However, the claims do not recite, "directly displaying a page for input that does not match a pre-assigned keyword".

16. With respect to claim 14, the applicant argues that the references do not teach entered information typed by the user along with user-dependent information not entered by the user in a session in which the information is entered. However, Osaku shows a user registration table (col. 21, lines 50-51) that must feature some form of user-dependent information. Even if, for arguments sake, none of the references showed "user-dependent information not entered in a session in which the information is entered", such language is broad enough to read on a network

Art Unit: 2142

access password. Passwords for network access were well known at the time of the applicant's invention and thus this limitation is not patentable for this additional reason.

17. With respect to claim 16, the applicant has not addressed the specific motivation provided in the last office action. The examiner maintains that the motivation explained in the office action mailed on 8/2/2005 is proper.

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is (571) 272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2142

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Douglas Blair

DBB



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER